

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/974,849

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI, YASUHIKO

Examiner

Drew E Becker

Art Unit

1761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Drew E Becker.

(3) _____

(2) Kevin McKinley.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 03 December 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Eaton & Steinthal

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed the amendment filed Nov 21, 2003. The amendments to claims 1 & 5 regarding the string being wound around 2 surfaces of the tag appear to define over Eaton & Steinthal. However, further search & consideration may be required.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Drew Becker
Examiner's signature, if required